



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,946	06/06/2006	Seiji Hosokawa	YAMAP0998US	3079
43076 7590 07/02/2009 MARK D. SARALINO (GENERAL) RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE, NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115-2191				
EXAMINER				
GWARTNEY, ELIZABETH A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/561,946

Applicant(s)

HOSOKAWA, SEIJI

Examiner

Elizabeth Gwartney

Art Unit

1794

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed 03/24/2009 has been entered. Claim 9 has been cancelled. Claims 1-8 and 10-17 are pending.
2. The previous 112 2nd Paragraph rejections have been withdrawn in light of applicant's amendments made 03/24/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 1-8 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosokawa (JP 2001-275552 – Patent Abstract and Machine Translation) in view of Hiroko (JP 09-149757 – Abstract only).

Regarding claim 1-2 and 5-6, Hosokawa discloses a hollow stick-like pretzel obtained by baking dough, extruded to have a hollow stick shape, containing a pregelatinized flour and cornmeal (i.e. cereal flour-[0026]) (Abstract, [0014], [0019], [0072]).

While Hosokawa disclose cornmeal (i.e. corn flour) the reference does not explicitly disclose that the non-gelatinized flour comprises roasted wheat flour.

Hiroko teaches a biscuit dough comprising wheat flour and a roasted wheat flour (Abstract). Hiroko teaches that the roasted wheat flour gives the biscuit good solubility in the mouth and crispy texture (Abstract).

Hosokawa and Hiroko are combinable because they are concerned with the same field of endeavor, namely, baked snack food comprising flour. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used roasted wheat flour, as taught by Hiroko, to replace all or part of the cereal flour in the baked hollow stick shaped pretzel dough of Hosokawa for the purpose of making a product with good solubility in the mouth and crispy texture.

Further, given Hosokawa discloses cornmeal (i.e. cereal flour including rye flour and corn flour), since Hiroko teaches a wheat flour free of gluten (i.e. roasted wheat flour), using roasted wheat flour to replace cornmeal would amount to nothing more than the use of a known flour free of gluten activity for its intended use in a known environment to accomplish entirely expected results.

Regarding claims 3-4, Hosokawa discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Further, Hosokawa discloses that the weight ration of non-gelatinized flour (i.e. cereal flour) to

gelatinized flour ranges from about 67:43 to about 1:99 (*see* 100 parts cornmeal (i.e. cereal flour and 1-50 parts gelatinized flour- [0020], [Claim 2]).

Regarding claims 7-8, Hosokawa discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above and that the gelatinized flour includes wheat flour (i.e. cereal flour - Abstract).

Regarding claim 10, Hosokawa discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above and that the dough includes: about 1 to about 67 parts by weight of sugars (i.e. saccharides) and about 1 to 33 parts by weight of oils and fat with respect to a total 100 parts by weight of the non-gelatinized flour and the gelatinized flour (**note:** Hosokawa discloses sugar and oil/fat with respect to 100 parts non-gelatinized flour or cornmeal, therefore, the quantities given above are adjusted to account for both the non-gelatinized flour and gelatinized flour - [0034]-[0038]).

Regarding claim 11, Hosokawa discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. While Hosokawa discloses sub-materials (i.e. taste providing material) including egg, salt, spice, and chemical seasoning ([0043]), the reference does not explicitly disclose a baked snack with 10 to 30 parts by weight of taste providing material with respect to the total 100 parts by weight of non-gelatinized flour and the gelatinized flour. As flavor intensity and character are variables that can be modified, among others, by adjusting the amount of taste providing material in the dough composition, the precise amount of taste providing material would have been considered a result effective variable by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. As such, without showing unexpected results, the claimed amount of taste providing material cannot be considered critical. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have optimized, by routine techniques, the amount of taste providing material in the dough composition of Hosokawa to obtain the desired flavor character and intensity in the baked

snack (*In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d. 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980)), since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. (*In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 223).

Regarding claim 12, Hosokawa discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. Given that Hosokawa disclose sub-materials (i.e. taste providing materials) broadly, since cocoa powder is a well known flavoring in baked products (i.e. taste providing material), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have chosen a sub-material, based on flavor preferences, including cocoa powder, and arrive at the current invention.

Regarding claims 13-14, Hosokawa discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above and that the outer diameter of the baked snack is 15 mm or less ([0063]), and an inner diameter thereof is 40% or more of the outer diameter ([0064]. Further, Hosokawa discloses that the thickness of the baked snack is 2.5 mm or less in at least a part thereof ([0057]-[0061]).

Regarding claim 15, Hosokawa discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above and that the inside of the hollow stick shaped baked snack is filled with a gustatory agent (i.e. filling material ([0074]-[0076], [0091], [0108])).

Regarding claims 16-17, Hosokawa discloses a method of making a baked snack comprising the steps of: (a) mixing non-gelatinized flour (i.e. cornmeal/corn flour) and gelatinized flour to obtain a mixed dough ([0044]); (b) extruding the mixed dough via a nozzle into a hollow stick shape to obtain a shaped dough ([0046]-[0048]); and (c) baking the shaped dough to obtain the baked snack having the hollow stick shape (*see* calcination [0014], [0072]). Further, Hosokawa discloses a step of injecting a gustatory agent (i.e. filling material) into the

inside of the hollow stick shaped baked snack via an open end of the baked snack ([0074]-[0076]).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/24/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that because the examples in Hosokawa use wheat flour as cereal flour and since "it is noted that when using wheat flour, it is preferable to use a weak wheat flour in the ratio of 50% or less from a view point of hardness of dough and the strength of gluten.", Hosokawa discloses a dough with large amounts of gluten. Therefore, given roasted wheat flour contains no active gluten, Applicant argues that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to use roasted wheat flour, as taught by Hiroko as the cereal flour in Hosokawa.

Hosokawa discloses a dough composition comprising cereal flour and a pre-gelatinized flour wherein well known cereal flours conventionally used for pretzels are used, specifically, wheat flour, barley powder, rye flour, Oates powder and corn flour ([0014],[0026]). Given that it is well known that corn flour and rye flour do not contain active gluten, it is clear that Hosokawa discloses a dough composition wherein the amount of active gluten is 5 weight% or less.

Therefore, given Hiroko teaches that roasted wheat flour gives the biscuit good solubility in the mouth and crispy texture (Abstract), since roasted wheat flour contains no active gluten, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used roasted wheat flour, as taught by Hiroko, to replace all or part of the cereal flour in the baked hollow stick shaped pretzel dough of Hosokawa for the purpose of making a product with

good solubility in the mouth and crispy texture. Further, using roasted wheat flour to replace cereal flour in the pretzel dough of Hosokawa would amount to nothing more than the use of known gluten-free flour for its intended use in a known environment to accomplish entirely expected results.

Given Hosokawa discloses a dough composition comprising a flour with no active gluten (i.e. corn flour, rye flour) and pre-gelatinized flour wherein the dough is formed into a hollow stick, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have replaced gluten-free flour (i.e. flour with no active gluten) with another gluten-free flour, such as roasted wheat flour, with the expectation that the dough would display similar properties.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1794

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Gwartney whose telephone number is (571) 270-3874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 7:30AM - 3:30PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/E. G./

Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/KEITH D. HENDRICKS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794